

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, and 23-38 In view of the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102: The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-15, 17-21, and 23-38 under §102(e) as being unpatentable over US Pub. 2003/0007819 to Wanda.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment and, as amended, recites the following acts:

1. placing production data received from a client in a queue, the production data including production options for a target document identified by the client;
2. generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing production data held in the queue, the production data to be delivered to one of a plurality of production devices;
3. presenting the queue interface to the client;
4. generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface; and
5. presenting the status interface to the client.

Claim 1 includes one or more acts not taught by Wanda. In short Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting that status interface. Wanda does not teach or suggest this.

The Examiner equates Wanda's group job management table shown in Fig. 18 with the queue interface recited in Claim 1. Without explanation, the Examiner contends that Wanda, Figure 16 teaches generating a status interface for a chosen

production device selected through the queue interface. This simply is not true. Wanda's Fig. 16 illustrates a data structure of group print information. Wanda, paragraph [0043]. This data structure is not a status interface and it is not a status interface for a chosen production device selected through Wanda's group job management table. Wanda's group print information is generated based on job information received from a client and then added to the group job management table. Wanda, paragraphs [0122]-[0125]. The generation of the Wanda's group print information has no relation to a selection of anything with regard to Wanda's group job management table.

The Examiner also mistakenly asserts that Wanda, paragraph [0173], reproduced below, teaches presenting the status interface to the client.

[0173] Next, in step s1508, the client manager 605 decides whether or not the printer of the job is instructed to be changed in accordance with the instruction of the user. When the client manager 605 decides that the printer of the job is instructed to be changed to a substitute, the procedure advances to step s1509. The client manager 605 notifies the server manager 611 of the server 610 of the substitute printer to return to the step s1502. Even in the case of the job, only the substitute printer may be designated relative to the print job whose printer is to be changed.

From all appearances, paragraph [0173] has no relevance with respect to Claim 1 as it mentions nothing of presenting a status interface of any kind to a client.

The Applicant cannot understand the Examiner's logic in relying on this paragraph. The Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to carefully explain how paragraph [0173] might suggest presenting a status interface to a client. It is noted that the presented status interface is a status interface generated for a chosen production device selected through the queue interface.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Wanda as are Claims 2-3 and 5-7 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 8 like Claim 1 recites presenting a queue interface, generating a status interface for a production device selected through the queue interface, and then presenting the status interface. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable,

so are Claim 8 and Claims 9 and 11-13 which depend from Claim 8. Claim 10 has been cancelled.

Claim 14 is directed to a computer program product for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 14 and Claims 15 and 17-19 which depend from Claim 14.

Claim 20 is directed to a computer program product for mediating access to production devices. The product includes a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 20 and Claims 21 and 23-25 which depend from Claim 20. Claim 22 was cancelled.

Claim 26 is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites elements for implementing the method of Claim 1. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 26 and Claims 27-31 which depend from Claim 26.

Claim 32 is directed to a system for providing queue management and production device status and recites the following elements for implementing the method of Claim 8. For at least the same reasons Claim 8 is patentable, so are Claim 32 and Claims 33-38 which depend from Claim 32.

CONCLUSION: The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell Sterling Simpson, et al.

By /Jack H. McKinney/

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

November 6, 2006